

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed May 23, 2007. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-18 are currently pending in this Application. Claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 13, 16, and 17 have been amended, claims 6, 12, and 18 have been cancelled without prejudice, and no claims have been added.

In view of the following remarks and foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims of the above-identified application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

**I. Drawings**

The Office Action Summary page of the Final Office Action dated May 23, 2007 indicates by the checking of box b under item no. 10, that the drawings filed on 13 March 2007 are objected to by the Examiner. However, on page 2 of the Final Office Action dated May 23, 2007, the Examiner states under item no. 3 that "the drawings were received on March 13, 2007. These drawings are acceptable." The Applicant assumes that box b under item 10 on the Office Action Summary page was inadvertently checked and that the Examiner meant to check box a. If this is incorrect, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reissue the Final Office Action to point out which portion(s) of the drawings to which the Examiner objects.

**II. 35 U.S.C. § 101**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-18 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This is rendered moot in light of the current amendments to the claims.

In making this rejection, the Examiner states that claim 1 "does not recite steps taken 'if an error is not indicated by one of the event logs' and actions to be taken 'if the corrective actions are not authorized'" and "therefore the claim does not present a tangible result." (Final Office Action, dated May 23, 2007, pages 2-3). However, without acquiescing to the Examiner's arguments and in the interest of furthering prosecution of the present application, the claims have been amended to conform with the Examiner's understanding of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 1, 7, and 13 were previously amended to include limitations regarding "actions to be taken 'if the corrective actions are not authorized'" and claims 1, 7 and 13 are currently amended to include additional limitations regarding actions to be taken "if an error is not indicated by on of the event logs." Claims 6, 12, and 18 have been cancelled, thus, rendering the rejection of these claims moot. Claims 3-5, 9-11, and 15-17 depend from respective ones of claims 1, 7, and 13.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-11, 13, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been overcome.

**III. 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph (written description)**

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 12, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is rendered moot in light of the cancellation of claims 6, 12, and 18.

**IV. 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. This is overcome and rendered moot in light of the amendments to claims 1, 7, and 13 and in light of the cancellation of claims 6, 12, and 18.

Therefore, the rejection of claim 1, 3-5, 7, 9-11, 13, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

**V. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness (Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 13, and 15)**

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sachse et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,985,901 B1; hereinafter Sachse) in view of Ganesh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,961,865 B1; hereinafter Ganesh) and further in view of Baron et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0064486 A1; hereinafter Baron). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 has been amended to include the following elements:

responsive to a determination that an error is not indicated by one of the event logs, for performing a query of directory service objects is performed to determine whether there are any errors and if an error is determined based on the query of the directory service objects, proceeding as if the error were determined by an event log;

responsive to a determination that an error is not indicated after a query of the directory service objects testing a plurality of components to determine if the plurality of components is performing correctly and if it is determined that one of the tests of one of the plurality of components failed, indicating an error and proceeding as if the error were determined by an event log;

responsive to a determination that an error is not indicated after a query of the directory service objects and responsive to a determination that no test of whether the plurality of components are functioning correctly failed, continuing to monitor the directory service;

These elements include similar features to those recited in cancelled claims 6, 12, and 18, but are reworded in a manner so as not to suffer from the alleged defects of claims 6, 12, and 18 in regard to 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Support for these new amendments may be found in the specification as filed on page 12, line 14 through page 14, line 25. These new elements are not taught or suggested by Sachse, Ganesh, or Baron, either individually or in combination. Although these elements are similar to the elements recited in cancelled claims 6, 12, and 18 which the Examiner was in possession of when reviewing the prior art, the Examiner did not find the elements as recited in claims 6, 12, and 18 or similar elements thereto in the prior art. Therefore, the Applicant believes and asserts that no new search is necessary and that the amendments to the claims may be entered without a new search by the Examiner.

Claims 7 and 13 include similar amendments as those provided by the current amendments to claim1. Therefore, the

arguments in support of patentability for claim 1 apply equally for claims 7 and 13. Claims 3, 9, and 15 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13 respectively and therefore are patentable for the same reasons as identified above for claim 1.

Therefore, the rejections of claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome.

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over Sachse, Ganesh. and Baron and is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

Applicants hereby authorize the Commissioner to charge any additional fees or refunds that may be required by this paper to Electronic Data Systems Corporation Deposit Account No. 05-0765. If, however, an extension of time is required, the extension is requested, and I authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to Electronic Data Systems Corporation Deposit Account No. 05-0765.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, or if further clarification is required, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

ATTY. DOCKET NO. 119166.1012 (LEDS.00117)  
CUSTOMER NO. 38851

AMENDMENT  
SERIAL NO. 10/715,059

**Please direct all correspondence to the practitioner  
listed below at Customer No. 38851.**

Respectfully submitted,



---

Stephen R. Loe  
Registration No. 43,757

The Law Office of Stephen R. Loe  
P.O. Box 649  
Frisco, TX 75034  
Tel. 469-734-3679  
Email: loe@friscopatents.com

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

September 24, 2007